

dent, it shall notify the President and the then Acting President of its decision by written communication, and the President shall forthwith reassume the powers and duties of the Office of President.

"Sec. 9. Whenever any individual is acting as President, he has acted as President, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 of this title, the word 'President,' as used in this section, shall be deemed to refer to that individual and the word 'Presidency,' as used in this section, shall be deemed to mean the powers and duties of the Office of President.

"Sec. 10. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

EFFECTS OF ANTI-ANTI-COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, modern warfare is fought with a multitude of weapons. When we think of the diversity of weapons available, we are oriented, unfortunately, to picture the weapons of modern warfare in only two classifications, conventional and nuclear. Mr. President, it is indeed regrettable that our thinking has become so bound by tradition, for the weapons of modern warfare are by no means limited to hardware.

One of the most potent weapons of modern, or total, war is propaganda. This is a weapon, the effectiveness of which has long been recognized, but the potential of which has increased with the technological development of mass communications media. It is an increase in potential at least equal in degree with the increase in explosive power accompanying the development of nuclear power to supplement and possibly replace conventional explosives.

Although the Nazis in World War II demonstrated the effectiveness of the propaganda weapon, it is continually apparent that we in America have not even yet developed a defense against propaganda. It is now being effectively used against us, and its normal potentiality is magnified by our own extreme vulnerability.

Mr. President, there is but one defense against propaganda attacks. That defense is knowledge of the truth. Propaganda, as it is used against us, is based on falsehood, and is often, if not always, shielded by a smoke screen of widely accepted, and even proven, slogans and clichés.

Mr. President, largely as a result of a National Security Council directive issued in 1958, organized efforts were undertaken to establish a defense against communism and particularly against the Communist use of the propaganda weapon. The defense consists of informing the American people, and particularly those in uniform, concerning the total nature of communism and its many methods and weapons of attack, including propaganda. Although this educational program was and is somewhat meager when measured in terms of need, it has been signally effective.

Indeed, our educational efforts on the total nature of communism have alarmed the Communists to the extent that the

Communist Party, U.S.A., was instructed to fight such educational programs as its number one priority for action. Typically, the Communist Party, U.S.A., resorted primarily to the weapon of propaganda, to which, despite recent educational efforts, we are still unbearably vulnerable.

The Communists are by no means amateurs in the use of propaganda. So subtle was the origination of the anti-Communist campaign that few recognized or suspected its origin. Typically, the real purpose of the campaign was camouflaged behind an unchallenged and unchallengeable principle to which all Americans subscribe—the principle that the military should be subject at all times to civilian control and should not usurp policymaking functions from duly constituted civil authority.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the able Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the courageous and distinguished Senator, who speaks with authority on this subject because of his long and brilliant military career.

I should like to ask the Senator if he feels that the question of what Army officers can say not only to their men but also to the general public involves a very basic issue which transcends all personalities in or out of government.

Mr. THURMOND. I think our people in uniform generally should not speak promiscuously on all subjects, but they are entitled to tell their own military personnel and entitled to tell the civilian population the aims, the methods of operation, and the dangers of the enemy. The enemy today is communism. I feel there is a censorship now being placed upon our military people with regard to expressing themselves concerning our enemy, communism.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree. The official policy which must be determined by the Congress and the Executive involves the maintenance of freedom and the avoiding of censorship, and is something so fundamental it is not involved in personalities. Would the Senator agree?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would certainly agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. After all, our military people are citizens. They have certain rights. I can realize it is inappropriate for them to participate in partisan politics and things of that nature, but that is not the question before us today. There is no foundation to the charge that they are participating in partisan politics. As I shall state in a few minutes, this is a very vital question affecting the right of freedom of speech, but also affecting the vitality of the Nation.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. Perhaps the junior Senator from Nebraska has not made his question clear.

In the opinion of the Senator from South Carolina, does this not involve a major policy decision to prevent censorship, far beyond any disagreement we as individual Senators may have, or beyond any utterance we may have made in the past?

Mr. THURMOND. I would certainly agree with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, it is a matter which ought to be debated to find the correct course for the country, and is not merely a disagreement between Senators.

Mr. THURMOND. I concur with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska in the statement he has just made.

Mr. CURTIS. In keeping with the spirit that we are not criticizing anyone personally but are talking about a plan of action, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to yield further so that I may ask unanimous consent to have an editorial, which was published in the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Wednesday, August 9, 1961, inserted in the Record. It is apropos of what the Senator is discussing.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield for that purpose.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AFTER THE TWILIGHT

Most of today's editorial page is given over to publication, in full, of the amazing memorandum sent by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, to the President and the Secretary of Defense about 2 months ago.

In general, the statement denounces American military officers who have sought to educate their troops and the public in the dangers of internal Communist subversion; it offers recommendations for putting a gag on these men. The document was carefully leaked to the New York Times in June. It resulted in the promulgation by the Defense Department on July 10 of a new directive intended to tighten review procedures on all speeches and public relations activities by top generals and admirals. But though rumors of the memorandum's existence were widespread in Washington, it was not until August 2 that South Carolina's Senator Strom Thurmond managed to get his hands on a text. He put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Later the same day, Senator Fulbright acknowledged the statement as his own.

Senator Goldwater has described the Fulbright memorandum as "the most shocking document I have seen since I have been a Member of the Senate." Senator Karl Mundt has termed it "a shocking and utterly unrealistic document of abject appeasement."

If Mr. Fulbright himself had not vouchsafed the validity of the accompanying text, we would have suspected some elaborate hoax. It is almost incredible that a U.S. Senator who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee could have drafted the document.

Senator Fulbright's purpose is to soften the resistance of the United States to the dangers of communism. He thinks it quite possible that "the principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the people to hit the Communists with everything we've got." To suppress that desire, he would gag the militant generals, prohibit their participation in anti-Communist education programs, and smear the knowledgeable foes of communism as "radical rightwing speakers."

Senator Fulbright reveals, throughout his memorandum, a profound contempt not only for top-ranking officers, but also for the people as a whole. Though the overwhelming majority of the officers are college graduates who have traveled widely, he sees little in their education, training, and experience that might equip them for a "proper